

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-2 and 4-12 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4-8 and 10-12 are amended, support for which is found in the original claims, in the specification in Fig. 10C and on p. 24, l. 23-26 and l. 35-37. Claims 3 and 13-14 are canceled without prejudice. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-5 and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 2001-022499 (Suzuki); and Claims 6-7 and 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki and further in view of U.S. 5,017,770 (Sigalov).

The rejections in view of Suzuki are respectfully traversed in view of amended Claim 1, which recites:

A force feedback apparatus comprising:
a jetting unit that includes nozzles and that is configured to control a jet amount or a jet direction of gas or liquid jetted from the nozzles; and
a jet control unit configured to control the jet amount or the jet direction of the gas or the liquid according to a position or an orientation of a receiver that is configured to receive a pressure by the gas or the liquid jetted from the jetting unit so as to provide force feedback to the operator, wherein the position or the orientation of the receiver is measured by a receiver measurement unit,
wherein, **the nozzles are arranged in an equilateral triangular shape in the jetting unit, and when the receiver has a concave shape of a diameter D, intervals for placing each of the nozzles in the jetting unit are set such that at least one nozzle exists within a region having a diameter of a constant $\times D$, in which the constant is a positive value equal to or less than 1.**

The Office Action relies on Suzuki to describe a jetting means. However, Suzuki fails to describe, “when the receiver has a concave shape of a diameter D, intervals for placing each of the nozzles in the jetting unit are set such that at least one nozzle exists within a region having a diameter of a constant $\times D$, in which the constant is a positive value equal to or less than 1,” as recited in amended Claim 1. Further, Suzuki fails to describe a jetting unit

including “nozzles [which] are arranged in an equilateral triangular shape in the jetting unit,” as recited in amended Claim 1.


As to the rejection of Claim 8, Claim 8 is amended to recite, in part, “the nozzles being arranged in an equilateral triangular shape in the jetting unit, wherein, when the receiver has a concave shape of a diameter D, intervals for placing the nozzles in the jetting unit are set such that at least one nozzle exists within a region having a diameter of a constant $\times D$, in which the constant is a positive value equal to or less than 1.” In accordance with the above-comments with regards to the rejection of Claim 1, Suzuki fails to describe these features as recited in amended Claim 8.

None of the other cited references overcome the above-noted deficiencies of Suzuki. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 have been overcome.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above comments, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome and the pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)